UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,038	04/30/2001	Brian T. Murren	GE1-008US 5210	
21718 LEE & HAYE	7590 01/30/2007 S.P.L.C.		EXAMINER	
SUITE 500			PAULA, CESAR B	
421 W RIVER SPOKANE, W			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	•		2178	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	,		01/30/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhpto@leehayes.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/847,038	MURREN ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
·	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 03 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		•	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	``	20(-) #	ta audamaian fan
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropri nally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially rec		the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al		timalu filad amandma	nt conceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•	•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:	*		
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-5,7-10,12,14-27,29,30 and 34-37. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			•
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fai se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a).
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowar	ice decause:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
		CESAR B PAULA	
		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2178	•

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claim 1, the Applicants remark that Hitchcock fails to teach each interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request, and that the interaction may direct how the business logic will process the request (page 12, parag.3). The Examiner disagrees, because Hitchcock teaches information submitted on a form, and which is formatted using HTML tags (col.11, lines 45-col.12, line 29, col.14, line 49-col.16, line 27). In other words, the data input in the form data request interaction, includes the HTML tags which inform the validation software the type of information to be processed by the software. According to the claim language, the interaction may or may not do many things. However, the claim is silent as to the directing of the processing of the request.

Moreover, the Applicants indicate that Hitchcock fails to teach that the business logic process rquests submitted subsequently via the form (page 12, parag.4). The Examiner disagrees, because the form and its submitted data are processed following or subsequently to the filling out of the requested data. The validation software is used to match the data submitted in the form with the rules of the software in order to determine whether or not the data is valid.

Regarding claim 20, the Applicants point out that Hitchcock fails to disclose the determination of at least one attribute that are used by a business logic (page 16, parag.4). The Examiner disagrees, because Hitchcock teaches using attributes to automatically add fields to the form, used to submit data to the validation software (col.6, lines 3-11, col.7, lknes 29-38, col.8, lnes 60-col.9, line 20, col.15, lines 27-46, and col.21, lknes 1-67).

Regarding claim 34, the Applicants indicate tha Hitchcock fails to teach a tag library or valication code from the tag library (page 20, parag.1). The Examiner disagrees, since a data structure contains the attributes that need to be input into a certain field, such as a ssn (col.10, lines41-col.11, line 67).

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER